(7)

Huchum No. 73 dated 3-8-92 issued from the Tumkur Taluk office to Somanjanaia Son of deceased Patel Hundon Janjaia of the Jodi Village of Saliyavanjala of Tumkur Kasaba.

Pallakki Hanumanthi Chari agent of the above Village submitted a petition and also deposed to the effect that the Patelli register of the said Jodi Village of Saliyavanjala having been in your father's name he was himself conducting the duty and died 10 or 12 years ago, that the register was still in the name of the deceased, that you having been a minor at the time were now fit for ~~work~~ and that orders might be issued to the office being registered in your name and work taken from you. They were submitted to the Huzur with reference from the previous register. On reply Huchum No. 605/133 dated 22-7-92 has been received directing that the Patelli appointment may be made in accordance with the statement of the Agent. Consequently Separate ..... issued to the

Shekhar and to the agent directing
that your name should be entered
in the Police register and work taken
from you. You should conduct the
duties properly in obedience to the
orders of the Agent, and the Jamadar.

1893-94.
(R.)

File No 129 of 93
Serial No. 409

Sub. Dispute regarding the Patel of Sathyamangala village Tumkur Taluk

(11)

~~Swifdel~~ Swifdel-lee complied accordingly.

Petitioner Komarasamy Poonda having presented a petition for reconsideration of his order No. 217 of 10-1-94 he was granted the following Endorsement - No. 248/2 of 2-3-94.

As this is an Inam village all his labourers should in future be represented by the Incumbars - The Incumbars stated that Murugesa Poonda had been conducting this Patili from a long time, that you were nominated by the office as a criminal charge was preferred against him and as the Chief Court acquitted him of the above charge the Incumbars having arranged to get him reinstated in the office applied here for Sanction under Section 4 of the Rev. Rules - Sanction was accordingly accorded thereto - Nothing can now be done here -

P F. 49995

G. R. S. IX-5

Previous references.

1893-94
~~192~~ .
(L.R.)

File No 129 of 93.

Serial Nos 1 to 9

Later references.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT

Serial Nos. 1 to 9

m ~~Part~~ B for January 1896.

SUBJECT.

Dispute regarding the Patelgi of Sirtyamangala Village - Tumkur taluk.

(8)

Number of Journal Entries
Received - Vol. 217 Folio 1/2
Copy of Petition Secretary
Petitioner of the Justices Office
Newfield - Tompkins County

To the Honorable Justices
of the Supreme Court of the
State of New York held in
and for the County of Tompkins
at the Courthouse in the City of
Ithaca in said County on the
day of

The Petition of the Undersigned
Citizens of the Town of Newfield
in said County respectfully
shows:

That your Petitioners are
desirous that a Justice of the
Peace be elected in and for
the Town of Newfield aforesaid
to fill the vacancy occasioned
by the resignation of the late
Justice thereof. That the
Term of Office of said Justice
will expire on the

2-10-93

who signed as follows.

We, the undersigned, being the officers duly appointed, qualified and acting as such, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of the proceedings had at a meeting of the Board of Trustees of the Village of Lawrenceville, held on the 2nd day of January, 1934, as appears from the minutes of said meeting now in my possession.

In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the seal of the Village of Lawrenceville, this 3rd day of January, 1934.

(9)

2-10-93 Jan 93

Jan 3-1-34

Village Clerk.

Approved 1-2-34.

(10)

At the regular meeting of the Board of Trustees of the Village of Lawrenceville, held at the Village Hall on the 2nd day of January, 1934, at 8 o'clock P.M. pursuant to adjournment.

Present: Trustees Hall, Jones, Smith, Brown and Green.

Absent: None.

Trustee Hall moved that the following ordinance be passed, which motion was seconded by Trustee Jones, and upon the question being put to the Board of Trustees, the following Trustees voted as follows:

Ayes: Trustees Hall, Jones, Smith, Brown and Green.

Nays: None.

Whereupon the President declared that the motion had been carried and the ordinance passed, which ordinance is as follows:

- Quest

6

G.R.S. III—3]

Routine Notes.

[To be used only for notes, requisitions, etc., not intended for permanent record.]

Manager Canada Life Company
wants Lic. 167 of the P. A. and Cat-
-ticed to pay a fine of Rs. 10 in Ci-
-minal Case No. 20 of 1892 on the file
of the Treasury Officer of Jamna
and Asst Superintendent Income Tax.
The Case [illegible] was decided
by the District Court in Civil Suit
No. 103 of 1892.

The order appointing
Manager Canada Life is not
in the file

N.B.—Should routine no
the notes must
this form.

Murugesandra - protected
Hemmaganahalli boundary
finalised amicably by
West of Chord

ಮುರುಗೇಶಂದ್ರ ಹೆಮ್ಮಗಾನಹಳ್ಳಿ
ಸರ್ವೇಕ್ಷಣ ಅಳತೆಯ
ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ 217 of 10th Jan
94

Allows the Superintendent of Survey
on the Journal of Hemmaganahalli
and the work was done by
Murugesandra
1122 of 9th Nov 94

Both Murugesandra & Hemmaganahalli
are said to have been carried
of thefts and punished. There
are no references on the subject
in the record - The particulars
of these convictions must be
ascertained before final orders
can be based in this matter.

Thowfiq Hamidullah Saheb KAS.

19.7.95

Dy Commr 20/7/95

Assistant Commr & Dy. Commr
Q.
20/7/95

The reason of this appeal is
apparently the inconsistent
orders passed by the Dy
Court of Tumkur regarding

9

5

Before the Government of *His Highness* the Maharaja of Mysore.

Appeal No. 253/ of 11-24

Appellant. Vs. Respondent.s

Hanmagauda Gowda
by Sri K. T. Narasimha Iyengar
Advocate

1. Hanumanthachar
2 Srinivasachar
3 Varadachar
4 Vijayendrachar
5. Gundachar
6. Thimma Gowda.

Notices served.

5. 95.

Decision.



12-10.93

Order No. 5 : 7

Order No. 5 : 8 / 7 of dated 18.12 with Vaidhya

No. 1.

the rejecting and appointment
of a Patel to the Gramallag
of Sallyāvangala of the Tumkur
Taluq.

The last transfer
of the Register was in 1866.
Patel Hanumegowda was the Register
Patel and for some offence which
he committed he was removed.
He had then a son by name
Mungegowda, and a brother
by name Muddugungegowda.
By order No. 436 of the 10 th Sept
1866 Mungegowda was passed
over as he was the son of a
Patel who was guilty of an
offence and brother of Muddu
gungegowda was appointed
to succeed Hanumegowda. His
Mungegowda who was thus
passed over was convicted
of theft of a turban and fined
in a sum of ten Rupees.
Muddugungegowda died a few
years after, but no action
was taken to get the entries

in the Salli Nyaka allowed.
Hommagunegowda son of
Muddagunegowda was a minor
and Gunegowda drifted into
doing the work for him - He did
something which at least the main
-dars when action was for the
first time taken to appoint
formally a Naickar & Muddu
-Ganga - There was a recommendation
in favour of Hommagunegowda
and the Deputy Comr accepted to
and appointed him to the appt. by
(Vide order No 105 of the 21st July 1892
& order No 517 of 12-10-93) - But then
Murugegowda had been convicted
of a criminal offence which counted
was however quashed by the Chief
Court. This was not the conviction
of theft already referred to. But
some of the Maundars sided with
him and he began to agitate
his claim - Nayakal Maundars They
held a meeting and passed

a resolution nominating Munge
Gowda and forwarding a
the recommendation made
by Hanumanta Rau who
had been for some time employed
in favour of Hanumegowda and
had acted as Agent. A 200 copy
of the resolution was submitted
to the Dist Court, who having
regard to Sec 4 of the Rules
accepted this arrangement recommended
that also and directed the Register
to remain in the name of
Hanumegowda, as already agreed
the work will be done as hitherto
by Munegowda (Order No 217
of the 10th Jan 94 & 1122 of 9th
Feby 1894). The result has
been that Hanumegowda is the
only Patel who by age & qualifi-
-fication is fit to do the work
duties & yet Munegowda has
been denied official status.
This arrangement is not satis-
factory and unless the Register
Patel is shown to be incompetent
to officiate as Patel it is inexpedient
- may improper to appoint a

^ its acceptance by the Dist Court

15

The following facts appear from the copy of Amildar's report & other papers produced with the appeal Petition:—

Appellant's ~~grand~~ father and Murigappa's father were divided brothers. Murigappa's father was formerly the Patel but he was convicted of a criminal offence, whereupon the Dy Comr, in 1866-67, passed over Murigappa on the ground he was the son of the convict and appointed Appellant's father. The latter held the office till his death which occurred about 12 or 13 years ago. No successor was formally appointed & his son the Pltr was a minor. The Inamdars however appear to have been getting the work done by Murigappa. In 1892 the Petitioner applied for the registry of his name & the Inamdars agent gave a deposition in his favor. Thereupon the Amildar under the orders of the Dy Comr directed that Petitioner be registered as Patel & do enter upon the duties. There are two factions in the village and the Vrittidars are also divided.

There was an agitation in favor of Muniyappa by some of them, while others supported Petitioner. The Amildar in reporting this State of things on 2nd April 1893 stated that it was not a question of appointing a new Patel under Section 4 of Revenue Rules because there were Halkdars and one of them the eldest son of the last holder had been appointed, and that the nominee (Petr) had been spoken of by the Mamlatdar's Agent & the ryots as performing his duties satisfactorily. The Dy Commr in reply stated as follows on 12 Oct 1893: — The man in whose name the office had been registered, having died, the registry has been made in his son's name. I do not understand how in Miscellaneous proceedings that can be changed now & another man's name entered."

What transpired afterwards & induced the Dy Comr to pass an order to oust Petr does not appear from the papers produced.

Recd in para 7 of Collr's report dt 65 dt 17.7.94

BR 13/2

substitute for him - Munga was
available when the Registry was
transferred in 1866 and was at
passed over - He was subsequently
convicted of theft and that conviction
still subsists. His domestic
work is not rebutted by any
authority and Homagunga
was for a long time a minor -
It is true that Homagunga has
been also convicted of [illegible]
some gaps from a pasture ground
of one of the Maundars, but as
the punishment is the fine of half
a rupee & the offence
was of a trivial nature. He was
properly appointed to succeed his
father and the illegality of the thing
in this name has not been objected
to. There is no reason whatever to prevent
him from enjoying the privileges attached
to such appointment and doing the duties
thereof. The subsequent order of 1822
which directs that the work shall be done
by Mungesgowda is set aside, and it is
hereby directed that Homagunga whom
the Registered Patil will do the duties thereof.

Adduced Statement taken for Criminal Enquiry
15.1.96. [illegible] 22/1/96

18 (5) (4)

(General Serial No. 30.)

1894.95 761.

From The Deputy Commr
Tumkur District

To

The Chief Secretary to the Govt of Mysore.

Dated 17th July 1894.

Despatched 18 —do—

Received

Enclosures No. 3 V. files

General No. 65.
No.

His Official Memo
No. Cot 1856 dated the 15th May
1894.

Reports on the petition
of Patél Doddagunjé
Gowda of the Jodi village
of Satyamangala in
the Tumkur Taluk.

Rec'd 20/7

19

No. 65
Cuddalore 31st Jules

Deputy Commissioner's Office,
Tiruttani District.
Dated 17th July 1894.

To,
The Chief Secretary to the
Government of Mysore.

Sir,

With reference to your Officia
Memo No. $\frac{\text{Cet}}{1856}$ dated the 15th May 1894,
forwarding for report and submissio
of proceedings, the petition from Patél
Hanumappé Gowda of the Jodi villag
of Satyamangala in the Tiruttani Tal
Complaining of his removal and th
appointment of another Patél of the
village, I have the honor to state a
follows:—

2. On the 19th July 1892, Ballaski
Hanumantha Char, agent of the hold
of the said Jodi village, applied to t
Amildar of Tiruttani stating that a
the then Patél Muniappé Gowda had
been convicted of Criminal breach of

(1)

L. R. 129-93-1

Special Reference
In time

Instructions in order.
Pl. see note 26/6 prays
13/3 that his promotion may not
be disturbed pending disposal
of the appeal

(General Serial No. 22.)

1894.

No. 245-91

Name of Petitioner. Patil Hirma Jagu Jan

Village. Sabyanaigalu

Taluk. Lanchur.

District. Do.

Date of Arzi.

Date of Receipt. 5-3-94

Date of Disposal.

No. of Enclosures. eight

Call for Br. & I report.—

2. Pre. believes that the appeal may be disposed of in due course & that no order can be issued to keep him in possession of the office till the appeal is disposed of

DF
2/5/94

ABSTRACT.

Appeal against the order No. 2468/2 dated 2-3-94 of the Deputy Commissioner Lanchur District, rejecting the application of the Inamdar of Sabyanaigalu to appoint one Hirma Jagu Patil of the village in lieu of petitioner.

The order appealed against is as follows:—

As there are many villages the conflicting claims of which may be, should be finally put before the Inamdar. It appears that from the beginning Hirma Jagu was doing the duties of the Patil office, that no criminal charge was brought against him, you were appointed thereon, & that he

Drafted
S. Dept.
8/5

he was acquitted ~~of~~ the charge by the Chief Court. So the Inquiries arranged to take the duties of the said office by him done & applied to this office for sanction according to the 4½ section of the Revenue Rules. We, sanctioned Your request and he done.

Grounds of appeal are

(1) The order of the Lower Court is opposed to law, evidence & the probabilities of the case....

The appellant is the Registrar of the said Public office & avers the judgment of it being likely to it.

(3) The Lower Court erred in applying the 4½ section of the Revenue Rules relating to the 14½ section of the Revenue Code to this case, according to the request of the Respondents who are one of the Petitioners

(4) That while the judicial order, dated 12-10-93. to the effect that the Respondents request cannot be granted on the Inquiries made, is still in force, the Lower Court erred in issuing another judicial order, dated 10-1-94, admitting the Respondents request as per 4½ Section of the Revenue Rules

Prays therefore that this Public office may be continued in him alone & that pending the disposal of this appeal in this office, the Deputy Commissioner of Kaple ordered not to compel him to hand over the charge of his office.

Additional Grounds of appeal

(5) That the Lower Court erred in not giving effect to the Inquiries made in accordance with the Law & Rules

The

to it as he had discharged the
duties of the office ever since the death
of the registered Patel about 12 years
ago, and was himself a half sharer
in it. He was accordingly
restored. Against this order the
petitioner appeals.

4. The petition with its enclosures
received with the Inam under
reply and the Vernacular Proceedings
relating thereto are herewith
submitted. —

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient Servant,

N. Venkatarangier

Deputy Commissioner.

Pet
1856

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE.

PETITION DEPARTMENT.

OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM.

Remainder to Petn No 2591 of 1893-94

The accompanying Petition No. 2591 of 1893-94
dated 31st March 1894 received at the
Dewan's Office from Patel Hanume
Gowda of Kaiganoor
in Sunkur Taluk, com-
plaining of his removal
and the appointment of
another as Patel of the
village
is forwarded, together with its enclosures, to the Deputy Commissioner
Executive instead for
submission of the proceedings
and a report of the facts of
the case and on the points
raised in the petition

2. The petitions and their
enclosures should be
returned.

13/5/94

By Order

Draft 15/5

15/5

BANGALORE, 15th May 1894

Chief Secretary.

Council order
SVR
8/5

M.G.C.P., Bangalore.—3-5-94.—1,000.

ಕ್ರ.ಸಂ. ವಿವರ ಪುಟ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ

1 10-9-66ರ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ 436ರ ಪತ್ರವ್ಯವಹಾರ ಪ್ರತಿ ಮತ್ತು ಕಾರ್ಯಾದೇಶದ ಪ್ರತಿ ಇದೆ. . . . .

1 1866-67ನೇ ಸಾಲಿನ ಜಮಾಬಂದಿ ಪತ್ರಿಕೆಯ 846ನೇ ಪುಟದ ಪ್ರತಿ ಇದೆ. . . . .

1 3-8-93ರ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ ಪತ್ರ ಮತ್ತು ಸಂ:20 ಪತ್ರವನ್ನು ಪ್ರತಿಯನ್ನು ಇಡಲಾಗಿದೆ. . . . .

1 2-3-94ರ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ 248ರ ಪತ್ರವನ್ನು ಪ್ರತಿಯನ್ನು ಇಡಲಾಗಿದೆ. . . . .

1 28-2-94ರ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆಯ ಪತ್ರವನ್ನು ಪ್ರತಿಯನ್ನು ಇಡಲಾಗಿದೆ.

1 1998ರ ಪತ್ರವನ್ನು ಪ್ರತಿಯನ್ನು ಇಡಲಾಗಿದೆ.

2 ಪತ್ರಗಳನ್ನು ಪ್ರತಿಯನ್ನು

---

7 1 73ನೇ ಪುಟದಲ್ಲಿ ಪತ್ರವೊಂದು ಇದೆ.

1 2-4-93ರ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ 546ರ ಪತ್ರವನ್ನು ಪ್ರತಿಯನ್ನು ಇಡಲಾಗಿದೆ.

---

9 1/4

ಪತ್ರಗಳನ್ನು ಪ್ರತಿಯನ್ನು ಇಡಲಾಗಿದೆ ಪತ್ರಗಳನ್ನು ಪ್ರತಿಯನ್ನು ಇಡಲಾಗಿದೆ.

that in respect of the Judicial proceedings connected to the case, the Financial Secretary of the Office need not visit Ranchi to represent in the name of the Registered Patients and Legal Counsel. However, reference to the Office, as mentioned above to the effect that the Patients Financial Secretary in the name of the deceased Registered Patient is required by the said Court. Accordingly, the said Court was instructed to communicate the petitioner (Praveen Poonia) the assets of the deceased Registered Patient. —

3. Subsequently the said Convicted Patient Sunil Gupta having appealed to the High Court, his conviction was set aside and the sentence of five hundred rupees. After the Conviction that the Office of Patient

refused

10992

Gen. Serial No. 31.] Pet 469 (6) 1er

1894-95.

(7)

From The Deputy Commissioner
Tumkur District.

To The Chief Secretary to the
Govt: of Mysore.

Dated 25th February 1895.

Despatched 26th — do —

Received

Enclosures No. 1 & V. file

General No. 727
No.

His Docket No. 6686/Pet. 558 of the
25th October 1894:—

Submitting a copy of the Chief Court order passed in Criminal petitions Nos: 109 and 118 of 1892, and furnishing information on certain points anent the petition of Honnagangé Gowda about the office of Patel of the godi village of Lathyannangala in the Tumkur Taluk.—

Submitted to 2nd Councillor
This is in continuation
of Tumkur Dy Commrs
letter no 65 dated 17 Jan 94.
The queries put by the Jud
Councellor are answered by
the Dy Commr in this letter.

26

Pet 469
1er

2/5/3

6 of Pet in
the course
& same notice
to the parties
concerned
WWB
10/4/95

L.R. 129-935

Pet 469
2/2

Tumkur District
Deputy Commissioner's Office
Dated 25th February 1895.

No. 727
Rec: 1½ V. file

To

The Chief Secretary to the
Government of Mysore.

Sir,

As required in your Docket No. 6686 / Pet: 558 dated the 25th October 1894, anent the petition of Honnagungé Gowda about the office of Patel of the godi Village of Kathyanangala in the Tumkur Taluk, I have the honor to submit herewith a copy of the order passed in Criminal petitions Nos: 109 and 118 of 1892, on the file of the Chief Court of Mysore.

2. The Village Shanbogue and the widow of the Registered Patel Mudda Gungé Gowda, say that he died in the great famine of 1876-77, and that at that time his son, the petitioner, was 4 or 5 years old. But Murigé Gowda, the present Patel of the Village, states that the deceased's son was then 12 or 15 years old. —

The present Patel Murige Gowda expresses

which may arise in the proceedings prior to the Convention should be referred to him. Some of the Societies also elect an Auditor. Where the parties of the Societies differed, one Visitor visits the meeting, Appointed Voter viz the Initiation Ceremonies and the other visits the Social Voter. — Immediately the Local Agent, Assistant Secretaries Clerk, &c. At the commencement of Voting each Delegate presents the Secretary with the Secretary's Letter of the Revenue Cards, the Societies were required to Convene a meeting and nominate three names the majority named Deputy. They elected that in the new notice Convention were elected via Triangle Canada Card Card the Office for it as 12 years the Council be elected

In the Chief Court of Mysore at Bangalore

Friday the 16th day of September 1892.

Present

T. R. A. Thumboo Chetty Esquire, Chief Judge,

and

A. Ramachandra Iyar Esquire, Judge.

Criminal Revision Petitions Nos. 109 & 118 of 1892.

In Criminal Revision Petition No. 109 of 1892

1. Moorge Gowda
2. Narasimhappa
(by Mr. L. Sreenivasiengar) } Petitioners - (accused)

Vs

Government of Mysore - Counter Petitioner (Complainant)

In Criminal Revision Petition No. 118 of 1892

P. Raghavendra Chary - - Petitioner
(by Mr. S. Ramaswamy Iyer) (complainant)

Vs

1. Moorge Gowda
2. Narasimhappa
(by Mr. L. Sreenivasiengar) } Counter Petitioners (accused)

Petitions against the conviction and sentence passed by the Treasury Assistant Commissioner

Commissioner and 1st Class Magistrate of Tumkur in Criminal Case No. 20 of 1892, and the order passed by the District Magistrate of Tumkur in Criminal his: Case No. 24 of 1892.

These petitions coming on for hearing this day, the Court pronounced the following

Order

The facts alleged by the Complainant himself did not shew that the accused persons had committed an offence. The Vrittidars and their agent or agents were not evidently acting in harmony and there were disputes in regard to the distribution of the profits of the Village and the compensation which had been paid by Government. The parties ought to have resorted to a Civil Court for the settlement of their disputes. We are surprised that the Magistrate not only took cognizance of a case which ought not to have come before a Criminal Court

at

Presented in Court
3/3/94

23



Rec'd. Regd. Post
DATE 3-3-94

29-1-96

Before the Council to The Govt. of Mysore

Petn No. 25-91 of '94-95

Petitioner Hanumaiah Gowda

C. Petn. Mariyegowda.

List of documents filed

by the Counter petitioner today

1. Dy Comrs order No 105 Dy 22-7-92
to the Amildar of Tarikere

2. Proceedings of the Jurisdiction
of the village of Valey Amanpla
Dy 14-8-93

3 Do Do Dy 20-2-93 with Amils
order No 2129 Dy 20-2-93.

4 Petition of the Jurisdiction of
20-2-93 to the Dy Comr with the
letters Endorsement No 287/3
Dy 20-2-93

From

To

Dated

Despatched

Received

Enclosures No.

General No.

No.

To

The Deputy Commr.
Tumkur District

No. 887 / P.185 & 20-7-95

Encl: 1V. file.

His letter No 727 dated 25th February 95, submitting further information in connection with the appeal of Honnaganga Gonda regarding the Patēli of the Jodi village of Satyamangala in the Tumkur Taluk.

(11)

L.R. 129-93-6

With reference to the above, has the honour to state that both Muriyegonda and Honnaganga are said to have been convicted of theft and punished, (vide papers Nos 12 and 29 in the list of vernacular proceedings) but there is no reference on the subject in the record, and to request that the records ~~~~ relating to these convictions may be forwarded to this office

2.

To

The Deputy Commissioner
Fanshawe District

No. 6686 / Pat 555 25/31 10-94

Encl / Copies

Herewith letter of 6th dated 17th inst 94
Applicant appeals to Head Office
Head Office refuses claim
Applicant claims

Reasons of Commissioner appealed against claim is made in Kindergraph
to forward to this office copy of
the Judgment of the Chief Court
regarded to the above and to
furnish information on the following
points as early as practicable.

I When did the registered Patel die?
And when was petitioner born?

II When was marriage of the deceased
Patel to Jamnabai celebrated?

Was the marriage registered
in the village Patel's Book? If
not why not? Was the deceased
Patel literate?

R. 02. 129-93-4

B. O.

25/10
Dy 11
(Connect order)

26/10
Dy Chief Secretary

24/10

(16) 514

Gen. 31.]

REVENUE DEPARTMENT
Gl. No. 1857
No.
1895 6 SEP 95
DEWAN'S OFFICE

Subt. to the Rev. Councillor
with reference to the order
dated 19-7-95
R. 10/9

L. R. 129-93-7

From The Deputy Commissioner
Tumkur district

To The Revenue Secretary
to the Govt. of Mysore

Dated 4th September 1895

Despatched — do —

Received

General No. 241
No.

Enclosure No. 1 & 2 V. files

His docket no: 887 & 920 to 8185
July 1895.

Submits certain record connected with the conviction for theft of Ellurige Gowda and Honnapuge Gowda claimants to the Potale Stock of the Jodi village of Satyamangala in the Tumkur Taluk.

P. Hole
6/9/95
Regd. Head Records 8/9/95

Tumkur District

No: 241
Rev: 1872 Files

Deputy Commissioner's office
Tumkur 4th September 1895

To

The Revenue Secretary
to the Government of Mysore

Sir,

With reference to your docket No: 887/P185 dated the 20th July 1895 and reminder No: Pet/574 dated 1st September 1895 (received today) calling for the criminal records connected with the conviction of Murige gowda and Hommagunge gowda claimants for the Potali hulk of the Jodi village of Taliyamangala in the Tumkur Taluk, I have the honor to state that the criminal record of the case in which Murige gowda was convicted is reported to be not forthcoming in the Taluk Magistrate's Record Room. An Extract from the

expresses his inability to produce the order nominating him to the office. But from certain other orders issued to him from the Taluk office and the Inamdars, it seems that he has been discharging the duties of Patel since 1872. In the Patéli register of 1875-76 he has been entered as the officiating Patel. This is all that can be ascertained. The particular date of his appointment cannot now be ascertained, nor can the nature of the appointment (whether officiating or permanent) be determined with precision.

4. The circular, record, received with the docket under reply ending with Gunthur Miscellaneous report No. 1053/1066 dated the 7th instant is herewith resubmitted.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant

Deputy Commissioner.

21

affd, out of two are connected the accused persons. He set aside the conviction and sentence and directed the accused to be released. The petition presented by the Complainant is rejected.

A true copy

Bijapur Bench

Dy: Registrar

A.D. to Registrar



5. Copy of order 33 of Court of Appeals in
Criminal Division
No 109 7/18 of 92

6. Evidence of two Judges and
Prosecutor
Peter Doe

7. 5-94

35

As early as practicable.

2. The Varmacular proceedings received with the above are returned for reference and recommission with the records now called for.

By Order

Draft

20-7-95

Revenue Secretary

C.

20/7

20/7

Criminal Register No. 8 of 1873 of the Tenkúr Zaluk is herewith submitted, from which it will be seen that Mauze Jowda was convicted of theft under Section 379 of the Indian Penal Code and sentenced to pay a fine of 10 Rs.

2. The record in criminal case no. 130 of 1873, on the file of the 2d class Magistrate of the Tenkúr Zaluk in which the accused Tommich and two others were convicted of theft and sentenced to pay a fine of 3 annas each is also submitted. The accused Tommich in this case is identical with Appellant Tommanje Jowda.

3. Enquiry is being made as to the loss of the record in criminal case No 44 of 1873 referred to in para: above.

4. The Executive proceedings received with your docket under reply are herewith returned.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most obedient Servant

W. Coffey Deputy Commissioner

[illegible]

[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]			[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	
				[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]				
[illegible]	[illegible]	13	15	5	"	"	17		18	

[illegible]

[illegible]

K. Ramamurthy

[illegible]

44	1		1	1		

(ج)

105

133.

Compared

Signed G. Ashwathappa

Copy applied for 8-11-93

Copying fee (0-1-2)

"True Copy"

Revenue Shirastadar

Double Entry
2nd Entry
Bloomington

1, 2—

ده ۲۷

. هیلاری کلینتون دعوی کرده است که او در سال ۲۰۱۶ به عنوان رئیس‌جمهور ایالات متحده آمریکا انتخاب شده است.

هیلاری کلینتون در سال ۲۰۱۶ به عنوان رئیس‌جمهور ایالات متحده آمریکا انتخاب شده است. او در سال ۲۰۱۶ به عنوان رئیس‌جمهور ایالات متحده آمریکا انتخاب شده است. او در سال ۲۰۱۶ به عنوان رئیس‌جمهور ایالات متحده آمریکا انتخاب شده است. او در سال ۲۰۱۶ به عنوان رئیس‌جمهور ایالات متحده آمریکا انتخاب شده است.

هیلاری کلینتون در سال ۲۰۱۶ به عنوان رئیس‌جمهور ایالات متحده آمریکا انتخاب شده است. او در سال ۲۰۱۶ به عنوان رئیس‌جمهور ایالات متحده آمریکا انتخاب شده است. او در سال ۲۰۱۶ به عنوان رئیس‌جمهور ایالات متحده آمریکا انتخاب شده است. او در سال ۲۰۱۶ به عنوان رئیس‌جمهور ایالات متحده آمریکا انتخاب شده است.

هیلاری کلینتون در سال ۲۰۱۶ به عنوان رئیس‌جمهور ایالات متحده آمریکا انتخاب شده است. او در سال ۲۰۱۶ به عنوان رئیس‌جمهور ایالات متحده آمریکا انتخاب شده است. او در سال ۲۰۱۶ به عنوان رئیس‌جمهور ایالات متحده آمریکا انتخاب شده است. او در سال ۲۰۱۶ به عنوان رئیس‌جمهور ایالات متحده آمریکا انتخاب شده است.

هیلاری کلینتون در سال ۲۰۱۶ به عنوان رئیس‌جمهور ایالات متحده آمریکا انتخاب شده است. او در سال ۲۰۱۶ به عنوان رئیس‌جمهور ایالات متحده آمریکا انتخاب شده است. او در سال ۲۰۱۶ به عنوان رئیس‌جمهور ایالات متحده آمریکا انتخاب شده است. او در سال ۲۰۱۶ به عنوان رئیس‌جمهور ایالات متحده آمریکا انتخاب شده است.

هیلاری کلینتون در سال ۲۰۱۶ به عنوان رئیس‌جمهور ایالات متحده آمریکا انتخاب شده است. او در سال ۲۰۱۶ به عنوان رئیس‌جمهور ایالات متحده آمریکا انتخاب شده است. او در سال ۲۰۱۶ به عنوان رئیس‌جمهور ایالات متحده آمریکا انتخاب شده است. او در سال ۲۰۱۶ به عنوان رئیس‌جمهور ایالات متحده آمریکا انتخاب شده است.

هیلاری کلینتون در سال ۲۰۱۶ به عنوان رئیس‌جمهور ایالات متحده آمریکا انتخاب شده است. او در سال ۲۰۱۶ به عنوان رئیس‌جمهور ایالات متحده آمریکا انتخاب شده است. او در سال ۲۰۱۶ به عنوان رئیس‌جمهور ایالات متحده آمریکا انتخاب شده است. او در سال ۲۰۱۶ به عنوان رئیس‌جمهور ایالات متحده آمریکا انتخاب شده است.

هیلاری کلینتون در سال ۲۰۱۶ به عنوان رئیس‌جمهور ایالات متحده آمریکا انتخاب شده است. او در سال ۲۰۱۶ به عنوان رئیس‌جمهور ایالات متحده آمریکا انتخاب شده است. او در سال ۲۰۱۶ به عنوان رئیس‌جمهور ایالات متحده آمریکا انتخاب شده است. او در سال ۲۰۱۶ به عنوان رئیس‌جمهور ایالات متحده آمریکا انتخاب شده است.

2/3019

3

ಅಂಚೆ ಕಾರ್ಡಿನ ಒಂದು ಬದಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಬರೆದ ಪತ್ರ

ಮಾನ್ಯರೇ,

ಈ ಕೆಳಕಂಡ ಪುಸ್ತಕವನ್ನು ಕಳುಹಿಸಿಕೊಡಲು ಕೋರುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಇಂತಿ ನಿಮ್ಮ ವಿಶ್ವಾಸಿ

ಕೆ ರಾಮಚಂದ್ರ

ಅಮಲ್ದಾರ್

ಹೆಚ್ಚಿನ ವಿಳಾಸಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಅಂಚೆ ಕಾರ್ಡಿನ ಇನ್ನೊಂದು ಬದಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಬರೆದ ಪತ್ರ

ಮಾನ್ಯರೇ,

ಈ ಕೆಳಕಂಡ ಪುಸ್ತಕವನ್ನು ಕಳುಹಿಸಿಕೊಡಲು ಕೋರುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಇಂತಿ ನಿಮ್ಮ ವಿಶ್ವಾಸಿ

ಕೆ ರಾಮಚಂದ್ರ

ಅಮಲ್ದಾರ್

ಪುಸ್ತಕದ ಹೆಸರು ಮತ್ತು ಕರ್ತೃ ಹೆಸರು ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಬರೆಯಬೇಕು — ೨೭/೨/೧೩

[illegible]



2

In the name of His Highness the Governor of Kanyam

Friday the 16th day of September 1892.

Present

The Hon'ble Thomas Hartley Esquire Chief

and

M. Ramachandra Iyer Esquire, Judl.

Criminal Revision Petition No. 178 of 1892

In Criminal Revision Petition No. 179 of 18

1. Aboraya Gowda
2. Narasimhappa
(by Mr. A. Ramaswamy Iyer) - Petitioners (Accused)

~~vs~~

Government of Mysore - Counter Petitioner (Complainant)

In Criminal Revision Petition No. 180 of 189

1. Raghavendra Rao - Petitioner (Complainant)
(by Mr. A. Ramaswamy Iyer)

~~vs~~

1. Aboraya Gowda
2. Narasimhappa
(by Mr. A. Ramaswamy Iyer) - Counter Petitioners (Accused)

Petitions against the conviction and sentence passed by the Assistant Commissioner and Ex-officio Sessions Magistrate of Gunakur in

Criminal

convicted of the theft of a turban and fined in a sum of ten rupees. Mudegange Gauda died a few years after, but no action was taken to get the entries in the Pateli Register altered. Honnagangegauda son of Mudegange Gauda was a minor, and Hurige Gauda drifted on to do the work for him. He did something to displease the Inamdars when action was, for the first time, taken to appoint formally a successor to Mudegange. There was a recommendation in favour of Honnagange Gauda, and the Deputy Commissioner accepted it and approved of his appointment (Vide orders No 105 of the 21st July 1892 and No 5-17 of the 12th October 93.) Just then Hurige Gauda had been

criminal Case No: 20 of 1892 and no
UB
order passed by the District
Magistrate of Amritsar in Criminal
Misc: Case No: 24 of 1892.

These petitions coming on for
hearing this day, the Court pronounced
the following:

Order

The facts alleged by the com-
plainant briefly stated are that
that the accused persons had
committed an offence. The Tribunals
and their agents or agents were not
evidently acting in harmony and
there were disputes in regard to the
distribution of the proceeds of the
village and the compensation
which had been paid by Government
The parties ought to have resorted
to a civil Court for the settlement
of their disputes. We are surprised
that the Magistrate should only have
enquired into a Case which
ought not to have come before a

Criminal

criminal jurisdiction, but he has also cancelled the revised person result against the conviction and against the sentence and directed the fine, if levied to be refunded. The petition presented by the accused has been rejected.

(Signed) T. R. Ramdas Chetty
Chief Judge

(Signed) C. Ramachandra Iyer
Judge

"True Copy"
A Thompson
Ag Registrar

Copy applied for 5/2/43
Ready for delivery 8/2/43 Rs 6
delivered to Rao & Ramaswamy Iyengar
3/2/43
A Thompson
Ag Registrar

COURT OF [illegible]

Copy issued 2-2-43
Original
Exhibit file
Papers - n-n-3
Total - 3-9

Entered
[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 1893 [illegible] 14 [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 1892 [illegible] 109 [illegible]

[illegible] 22 [illegible]

[illegible] 75-76 [illegible]

his name has not been objected to. There is no reason whatever to prevent him from enjoying the privileges attached to the registry and doing the duties himself. The subsequent order No. 1122 which directs that the work shall be done by Murieje Gaundanga is set aside, and it is hereby directed that Hannagunga who is the Registered Patel will do the duties thereof.

HGh
24/1

Draft
C243

For Revenue Secretary

To
The Deputy Commr
Dumka District with
records. ×

S.C.

× with follow-
ups today Mark

4

వాసుదేవాచారస్తు

కాళహస్తి వీరాచారి

పోతరాచ వేంద్రాచార్యనస్తు

[illegible]

[illegible]

వీరనిగమాచార్యనస్తు

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

(20)

57

Proceedings of the Govt of Mysore.

L.R. 129-93-8

Read:—

(1) Petition of appeal No 25-91 dated 3rd March 1894 presented by Honnayange Gowda of Satyamangala, Tumkur Taluk appealing against the order of the Deputy Commr of Tumkur directing that the Respondent Murige Gowda should be allowed to perform the duties of the Patels of Satyamangala, which has been registered in the appellants' name.

(2) Correspondence ending with letter No 241 dated 4th September 1895 from the Asst Commr, Tumkur District.

(3) The records relating to the case.

Order thereon 6685
R.T. 49-95.

The reason of this appeal is apparently the incorrect orders passed by the Deputy

Commission of Sunkur regarding the registry and appointment of a Patil to the Inam village of Satya-v-angala of the Sunkur Taluk.

2. The last transfer of the Registr was in 1866. Patil Nonne Gauda was the registered Patil, and for some offence which he committed he was removed. He had then a son by name Nanje Gauda, and a brother, by name, Nunda-ange Gauda. By Order No 436 of the 11th September 1866, Nanje Gauda was passed over, as he was the son of a Patil who was guilty of an offence, and brother Nundangange Gauda was appointed to succeed Nonne Gauda. Nanje Gauda who was thus passed over was

convicted

convicted of a criminal
offence, which conviction
was, however, quashed by
the Chief Court. This has
not the conviction of Yegi
already referred to. Some
of the Mamdais sided with
him and he began to
agitate his claim. They
held a meeting and
passed a resolution remi-
nding Sunrise Jewels and
protesting against the
recommendation made by
Kanmanthalan who had
been for some time employed
to act as Agent; in favour
of Annagarpeyarudu and
his acceptance by the
Deputy-Commissioner.
A copy of the resolution
was submitted to the
Deputy-Commissioner
who, having regard to
Section 4 of the Revenue Rules,
accepted this endorsement-
recommendation

recommendation also, and directed the register to remain in the name of Nsanganga Gavula as already ordered, but allowed the work to be done, as hitherto, by Muruja Gavula (Orders No 217 of the 10th January 94 and No 1122 of 9th February 1894) The result has been that Nsanganga is the Registered Palet, who by age and qualification is fit to do his own duties, and yet Muruja Gavula has been directed to officiate for him. This arrangement is not satisfactory, and unless the Registered Palet is shown to be incompetent to officiate as Palet, it is inexpedient — may interfere, to appoint a substitute for him. Muruja was available

when the Registry was opened
in 1866 and was yet-pasted
over. He was subsequently
convicted of theft, and
that conviction still subsists.
His doing the work is not
supported by any authority
and Hemingaya has been
~~been also convicted~~ was
for a long time a minor.
It is true that Hemma-
ganga has been also
convicted of cutting and
stealing some grass from a
native ground of one of
the Inamdars, but as
the punishment, viz. the
fine of half a Rupee, shows,
that the offence was of
a trivial nature. He
has properly appointed
to succeed his father, and
the keeping of the book in

M.S.G.

W.P. 12969/93-G

29-1-96

1 10-9- 6 మళ్ళీ 436 నెంబర్ లాక్ ది
కాదిచేంబర్ లో నంబర్ లో రద్దు చేసిన
నరిపుస్వరకారి -

1. 15-11-67 నాటి నవీన్ ఫ్యాక్టరీ లో ఇచ్చిన
లీజు ప్రకారం - 846 నెంబర్ ఇచ్చిన
పత్రం - 22-8-93.

1 3-8-93 నాటి మళ్ళీ ఆర్డర్ లో ది
నిర్ణయం లో ది 73 నెంబర్
పత్రం రద్దు చేసి ఇచ్చారు -

1 2-3-94 నాటి 248 నెంబర్ లో
పుదుచ్చేరి లో నివసిస్తున్న
కోర్టు వారు నిర్ణయించారు

1 28-2-94 న రద్దు చేసిన లీజు
కాలం లో ది ఆర్డర్ లో
1998 నెంబర్ లో ఇచ్చారు.
వ్యాపారం లో నంబర్ 2 లో లీజు
ప్రకారం వ్యాపారం లో నంబర్ లో
లీజు ప్రకారం లో నంబర్ లో
లీజు ప్రకారం లో నంబర్ లో
పత్రం లో నంబర్ లో

1 73 నెంబర్ లో నంబర్ లో
లీజు ప్రకారం లో నంబర్ లో
లీజు ప్రకారం లో నంబర్ లో

1 2/4 4-93 నాటి మళ్ళీ 546 నెంబర్
లీజు ప్రకారం లో నంబర్ లో
లీజు ప్రకారం లో నంబర్ లో

ఇ.

ఇ.ఆ. 2591 నెంబర్ లో

ఇ.ఆ. లో నంబర్ లో

లీజు ప్రకారం లో నంబర్ లో
లీజు ప్రకారం లో నంబర్ లో

పుదుచ్చేరి లో నివసిస్తున్న
కోర్టు వారు నిర్ణయించారు
లీజు ప్రకారం లో నంబర్ లో
లీజు ప్రకారం లో నంబర్ లో

పుదుచ్చేరి లో నివసిస్తున్న
కోర్టు వారు నిర్ణయించారు
3-3-94 నాటి
లీజు ప్రకారం లో నంబర్ లో
లీజు ప్రకారం లో నంబర్ లో

లీజు ప్రకారం లో నంబర్ లో
లీజు ప్రకారం లో నంబర్ లో
లీజు ప్రకారం లో నంబర్ లో
లీజు ప్రకారం లో నంబర్ లో

లీజు ప్రకారం లో నంబర్ లో
లీజు ప్రకారం లో నంబర్ లో
లీజు ప్రకారం లో నంబర్ లో
లీజు ప్రకారం లో నంబర్ లో